MTAC UG4
Meeting Report
June 24, 2015 12:30 pm to 1:30 pm.

The agenda for the meeting was as follows:

1. Review of BPM STIDs
2. Informed Visibility – development and requirements
3. AOB

BPM STID Discussion

Discussion opened with an overview of the underlying issue of developing a mechanism of including BPM in IMb Tracing. The group was updated on the solution that was developed and previously vetted with the group. Four key elements that have been accomplished regarding BPM STIDs were discussed:

- Enable Visibility of Bound Printed Matter (BPM) by including BPM in IMb Tracing

- Modify STID table to accommodate

- Validate MPE capability to read and report

- Validate ACS processes are enabled

Since the solution re-purposes STID's established for Full Service without IMb Tracing, a concern was raised with mitigating the use of Service Provider MID's for Full Service without IMb Tracing. The group agreed to further assess it.

ACTION ITEM: Himesh will send out the BPM STIDs.

Informed Visibility – development and requirements

The group was provided an overview of the current development cycle for IV and approach for the Mail Tracking and Reporting functionality.

The discussion began with item level data capture. Amy provided clarification on the nomenclature that IV is using for scans:

- Actual – this event is a scan of a physical mail piece, bundle, handling unit or container.

- Assumed –implied event for mail that is nested to mail aggregate, based on mail aggregate scan event.

- Logical – any other implied event based on business rules .

Amy reviewed Logical Delivery Event creation process.

Angelo inquired about the logical delivery events including cluster boxes within the geo-fence. In response, Amy indicated that the cluster boxes within a zip+4 range are included in the logical delivery events within the defined geo-fence. For high rise buildings, we roll up to the primary address level.

Angelo indicated that reference document(s) would be helpful in order to understand how this is being done, so he can consider different scenarios – such as PO Boxes. Amy indicated that requirements for P.O. Boxes were added recently, and have yet to be implemented. She will address the various scenarios

at a later meeting. **ACTION ITEM:** Amy to discuss Logical Delivery Event and ZIP+4 scenarios at a later meeting.

Amy indicated that all the requirements are not currently mapped to specific Sprints – the process just initiated. The program started with service measurement. Amy reviewed tentative Implementation Roadmap (without timelines) for Mail Tracking. IV is beginning planning for Release 4. The plan is to initially migrate IMb Tracing into the new environment. There is a need to establish an external data provisioning mechanism which is currently being worked.

The group was provided an overview of Data Format, Data Distribution/Provisioning, and Data Timeliness. Tracy Sikes inquired whether IV would manage customer profiles and the timeframe for when this would happen. Amy distinguished that data delegation for mail tracking will be migrated to IV. There is a need to develop a user interface, to include container and tray visibility. Angelo indicated that the format of the data is fine but it is not usable. He would like more information. Will it be in a mail.xml change? Tracy indicated that data is separately managed for IMb Tracing and for tray/container. In relation to data provisioning, Angelo inquired if the Mailers would continue to use the HelpDesk for issues. Amy indicated that a separate IV HelpDesk is envisaged which will support all IV inquiries – piece, bundle, tray, container data, and that the existing IMb Tracing helpdesk team would be used to staff the IV helpdesk. Additionally, it was noted that the data processing would now be more real-time and made available to users accordingly. It was however, caveated with the fact that the data timelines is dependent on the source system. Some data elements from 3rd party, such as airlines, would have a longer latency. Angelo indicated that it would be beneficial to have an SLA in place that would clearly articulate the relevant data availability, including latencies. **ACTION ITEM:** USPS to create the new SLA at appropriate time.

The group was provided an overview of the Data Access Authorization and Data Delegation and issues for consideration. Tracy indicated that improvements could be made, and wanted to know how data is provisioned. How are the CRIDs set up? Amy indicated that all data would be provisioned by IV – single system. Tray also indicated that a single registration process needs to be established, in contrast to how it is done today. With regards to the improvements mentioned, Shawn indicated that any changes to the XML will have to be managed through the XML group. Additionally, with regards to the data hierarchy in xml, Assumed events are needed in the XML files. How these events are reported and represented in XML needs to be evaluated. An inquiry was made regarding the timing for the release of this functionality in IV. Amy indicated that as planning is finalized, additional details will be shared with the industry. **ACTION ITEM:** The group to work on the various elements discussed to identify best approach.

On the subject of Data Delegation, currently, the Mail Owner or Delegate can see the data, as well as Mail Preparer or Delegate. In the future, Mailers should have the flexibility to give any delegate access. Today, a mail preparer can delegate, however, should they have a different set of rules? IV will enable others to choose which data format they want, select the records they want. (It may be just the first container, etc.). IV will expand, and provide visibility for containers and trays. There is also a desire to look at the MID in addition to mail owner/preparer. If so, we need more time to work on a communication timeline. Angelo indicated that the MID owner should have control over it. There should be a hierarchy of managing access to data. A user should be able to see (in their profile) the MIDs that they own, those that they have delegated to others, and those that have been delegated to

them. There was also a desire to have a process in place for data related to nested pieces with multiple MID owners. Amy indicated that all data delegation will move over to IV and there will be no limitation on data delegation. It is anticipated that MID level, CRID level or serial number range can all be used. At any time one can turn off the delegation. IV is setting up a way others can send a message/request.
ACTION ITEM: The group to work on the various elements discussed to identify best approach.

Additional discussions on IV will continue at the next meeting, due to time constraint.

Himesh brought to the attention of the group that there had been a proposal to increase the frequency of the meetings to weekly, considering the scope of items that need to be discussed. The group agreed.
ACTION ITEM: Himesh to change the frequency of the meetings.

The meeting was adjourned.